

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 21, 2005. Claims 6 to 10, 16 to 20, 26 to 30 and 32 are pending in the application, of which Claims 6, 16, 26, and 32 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 21 to 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The pending claims have been amended in line with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 21, 22, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,188,490 (Miyake). Claims 4, 14 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Miyake. Claims 3, 5 to 10, 13, 15 to 20 and 25 to 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Miyake in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,495,561 (Holt). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 6 is directed to an information processing apparatus for having a printer driver which generates print data to be printed at a printing apparatus using a plurality of pages of drawing data input from an application. The apparatus includes: entry means for entering a designation of N-page printing in which drawing data of N pages ($N > 1$, N is an integer) is printed on one print sheet; physical N-page printing arranging means for arranging the drawing data of each page at a center of each of equal N-divided areas of a physical sheet by scaling-down; printable region N-page printing arranging means for arranging the drawing data of each page in each of equal N-divided areas of a printable region on a physical sheet by scaling-down; determining means for determining which

one of said physical N-page printing arranging means and said printable region N-page printing arranging means is employed to execute processing for arranging the pages, when the designation of N-page printing is entered through said entry means; and generation means for generating the print data by executing the determined one of said physical N-page printing arranging means and said printable region N-page printing arranging means.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim is allowable as the cited references neither disclose nor suggest, neither alone nor in combination, at least the features of determining which one of a physical N-page printing arranging means and a printable region N-page printing arranging means are employed to execute processing for arranging pages, and generating print data by executing the determined one of the physical N-page printing arranging means and the printable region N-page printing arranging means.

Miyake discloses that the value N for N-up printing is determined so that it can be arranged on the number of sheets designated by a user. However, there is no disclosure in Miyake of determining which one of a physical N-page printing arranging means and a printable region N-page printing arranging means are employed to execute processing for arranging pages. In addition, Miyake fails to disclose generation means for generating print data by executing the determined one of the physical N-page printing arranging means and the printable region N-page printing arranging means.

Furthermore, Holt discloses providing page composition for N-up printing. However, as with Miyake, Holt fails to disclose determining which one of a physical N-page printing arranging means and a printable region N-page printing arranging means are employed to execute processing for arranging pages. In addition, Holt also fails to disclose generation

means for generating print data by executing the determined one of the physical N-page printing arranging means and the printable region N-page printing arranging means.

In light of the deficiencies of Miyake and Holt as discussed above, Applicants submit that amended independent Claim 6 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Amended independent Claims 16, 26 and 32 are directed to a method, a control program stored on a computer-readable medium and a computer-readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 16, 26 and 32 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Finally, enclosed is a copy of an Information Disclosure Statement that was filed in the USPTO on April 17, 2002. Applicants hereby request that the Examiner initial and return this copy so as to acknowledge that the applications listed therein have been considered and made formally of record.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank L. Cire', written over a horizontal line.

Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 103876v1